DETAILED ACTION

1. This Non-Final Office Action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed January 29, 2008. Applicant's amendment amended claims 1, 8, 9, 11 and 18. Currently, claims 1-24 are pending.

Response to Amendment

2. The objection to the specification containing the informality is withdrawn in response to Applicant's amendment. The rejections to claims 3, 4, 12, 13 and 19 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, is withdrawn in response to Applicant's amendment.

3. The declaration filed on January 29, 2008 under 37 CFR 1.131 is sufficient to overcome the Engelking et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0049911 A1) reference.

4. The terminal disclaimer filed on January 29, 2008 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of Application No. 10/660012 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11-16 and 18-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feria et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,020,621 B1) in view of Hack et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0187707 A1).

Regarding to claims 1, 11 and 18, Feria et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Feria et al. discloses a method, system and computer-usable medium of simulation (column 1, lines 40-42, column, 2, lines 20-24, column 28, lines 17-20) comprising: receiving, for at least one business transformation outsourcing service (i.e. computing equipment and services, total cost of ownership), cost inputs (column 2, lines 61-64), process inputs (i.e. ongoing cost) (column 4, lines 43-46), and information technology inputs (i.e. base costs) (column 3, lines 1-2), based on said inputs, performing a process simulation and an information technology simulation (i.e. scenarios) (column 2, lines 20-24, column 3, lines 65-67). However, Feria does not explicitly disclose benefits inputs, value inputs, benefits simulation, value simulation and outputting at least one measure of economic value for said business transformation outsourcing service. It is common knowledge in the prior art that cost inputs are a form of benefits inputs (i.e. spending less money/dollars saved) since when an organization or business spends money on a benefit, the organization or business essentially procures a benefit. Furthermore, Hack et al. discloses performing a value simulation (i.e. value calculation) (paragraph [0034], lines 6-8); and outputting at least one measure of economic value (i.e. return on investment) for said business transformation outsourcing service (paragraph [0034], lines 11-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method, system, and computer-usable medium of Feria et al. with the feature of including benefits inputs, value inputs, benefits simulation, value simulation and outputting at least one measure of economic value for said business transformation outsourcing service as taught by Hack et al., as both Feria et al. and Hack et al. are directed to the method, system and computer-usable medium for simulation. The motivation for doing so

would have been to determine the cost-benefit of implementing for at least one business transformation outsourcing service.

Regarding to claims 2, 12 and 19, Feria et al. discloses performing said simulations in different modes for different end users (i.e. organization, vendors, industry observers, etc.) (column 1, lines 20-28).

Regarding to claims 3, 13 and 20, Feria et al. discloses wherein said performing further comprises performing one or more simulations chosen from external use mode (i.e. organization's point of view) (column 2, lines 20-24).

Regarding to claims 4, 14 and 21, Feria et al. discloses wherein said performing a benefits simulation further comprises simulating at least one business transformation outsourcing service consisting of procurement (column 8, lines 11-12).

Regarding to claims 5, 15 and 22, Feria et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Feria et al. does not explicitly disclose mapping various forms of said benefits simulation to various forms of said business transformation outsourcing service. Hack et al. discloses mapping (i.e. collaborative Business Maps) the benefits and potential value that may be achieved of implementing business transformation outsourcing service (i.e. solutions) (paragraph [0033], lines 4-9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method, system and computer-usable medium of Feria et al. with the feature of mapping various forms of said benefits simulation to various forms of said business transformation outsourcing service as taught by Hack et al., as both Feria et al. and Hack et al. are directed to the method, system and computer-usable medium of simulation. The motivation for doing so would have been to determine the

relationship between the benefits to various forms of business transformation outsourcing service.

Regarding to claims 6, 16 and 23, Feria et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Feria et al. does not explicitly disclose representing various forms of said business transformation outsourcing service mainly by utilizing various forms of said benefits simulation. Hack et al. discloses representing (i.e. graphical depiction) various forms of said business transformation outsourcing service (i.e. scenario) by utilizing the benefits and potential value that may be achieved (paragraph [0029], lines 1-8, see fig. 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method, system and computer-usable medium of Feria et al. with the feature of representing various forms of said business transformation outsourcing service mainly by utilizing various forms of said benefits simulation as taught by Hack et al., as both Feria et al. and Hack et al. are directed to the method, system and computer-usable medium of simulation. The motivation for doing so would have been to represent to decision makers the potential benefits of implementing the business transformation outsourcing service.

Regarding to claim 8, Feria et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Feria et al. discloses a method of simulation (column 1, lines 40-42, column, 2, lines 20-24), said method comprising: performing a cost simulation (column 2, lines 61-64); performing a process simulation (column 3, lines 24-26); performing an information technology simulation (column, 2, lines 20-24); providing interactions among said simulations (i.e. correlation) (column 3, lines 59-67); and representing (i.e. summary report) with said simulations the use by a client organization of one or more business transformation outsourcing services (column 4, lines 17-

19). However, Feria et al. does not explicitly disclose performing a benefits simulation and value simulation. It is common knowledge in the prior art that cost simulation is a form of benefits simulation (i.e. spending less money/dollars saved) since when an organization or business spends money on a benefit, the organization or business essentially procures a benefit. Furthermore, Hack et al. discloses performing a value simulation (i.e. value calculation) (paragraph [0034], lines 1-4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Feria et al. with the feature of performing a benefits simulation and value simulation as taught by Hack et al., as both Feria et al. and Hack et al. are directed to the method of simulation. The motivation for doing so would have been to determine the cost-benefit of implementing for at least one business transformation outsourcing service.

Regarding to claim 9, Feria et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Feria et al. discloses receiving, for said one or more business transformation outsourcing service, cost inputs (column 2, lines 61-64), process inputs (i.e. ongoing cost) (column 4, lines 43-46) and information technology inputs (i.e. base costs) (column 3, lines 1-2). However, Feria et al. does not explicitly disclose benefits inputs and value inputs. It is common knowledge in the prior art that cost inputs are a form of benefits inputs (i.e. spending less money/dollars saved) since when an organization or business spends money on a benefit, the organization or business essentially procures a benefit. Furthermore, Hack et al. discloses performing a value inputs (i.e. savings) (paragraph [0034], lines 6-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Feria et al. with the feature of benefits inputs and value inputs as taught by Hack et al., as both Feria et al. and Hack

et al. are directed to the method of simulation. The motivation for doing so would have been to perform a benefits simulation and value simulation to determine the benefits and value of implementing for at least one business transformation outsourcing service.

7. Claims 7, 10, 17 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feria et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,020,621 B1) in view of Hack et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0187707 A1) and further in view of Sarno (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0042751 A1).

Regarding to claims 7, 10, 17 and 24, Feria et al. and Hack et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Feria et al. and Hack et al. do not explicitly disclose outputting cost quantities and benefit quantities for a plurality of years. Sarno discloses outputting yearly summarized cost quantities (i.e. expenses) and benefit quantities for recommending business transformation outsourcing services (i.e. business case) (paragraph [0003], lines 4-9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method, system and computer-usable medium of Feria et al. and Hack et al. with the feature of outputting cost quantities and benefit quantities for a plurality of years as taught by Sarno, as Feria et al., Hack et al. and Sarno are directed to the method, system and computer-usable medium of simulation. The motivation for doing so would have been to determine the cost and benefit for at least on business transformation outsourcing service over a period of time (i.e. short-term, long term, etc.).

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Bonabeau (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0053991 A1) discloses a method and system for generating new business models. Church et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0148209 A1) discloses a method for producing an infrastructure project estimate. Hoskin et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0162763 A1) discloses an accelerated sourcing and procurement framework. Jin et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,076,474 B2) discloses a system for simulating business processes. Kruk et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0120528 A1) discloses a method of managing compliance with strategic business rules. Razum et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0144953 A1) discloses a total cost of ownership model. Zarb (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0039619 A1) discloses a system, method, apparatus, means, and computer program code for analyzing an organization.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GEORGE PARK whose telephone number is (571)270-3547. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/George Park/
Examiner, Art Unit 3623
/Jonathan G. Sterrett/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623